

**ACTIVE CASES**  
**Analysis January 2004 QA Results for Food Stamps**

**Sample Size:** 88  
(drops excluded)

**Totals for January 2004:**

LOCATION	TOTAL SAMPLE ISSUANCE	# of ERROR CASES	ERROR DOLLAR TOTAL	PERCENT DOLLARS IN ERROR	FFY 2004 ERROR RATE
STATEWIDE	16,278.00	13	972.00	6.0%	7.9%
MILWAUKEE	7,604.00	9	797.00	10.5%	11.1%
BAL- STATE	8,674.00	4	175.00	2.0%	5.4%

**ERROR CAUSES BY TYPE:**

- **10-** Agency Preventable Errors
- **2-** Client- one "failure to report," one provided fraudulent document
- **1-** Agency Error- no penalty since some obscure CS info involved

**OVERVIEW OF THE ERRORS AND WHERE THEY OCCURRED:**

Of the 10 APES, seven were in Milwaukee, and three in balance of state.

Of the 2 client errors, one was in Milwaukee and one in balance of state.

**TYPES OF APE ERRORS (10 total):**

- 2- Shelter:** failed to budget correctly
- 2- Household Composition-** agency failed to include all Food Group members.
- 1- Child Support Expense:** agency budgeted CS expense paid for children in the FS group.
- 1- Child Support Income:** agency failed to recalculate CS at re-cert.
- 1- Wages & Salaries:** agency failed to recalculate at re-certification.
- 1- Self-Employment:** agency budgeted SE as regular wages.
- 1- Unemployment Comp:** Agency failed to budget actual UC for month one of application.
- 1- No Application:** agency opened FS without application (QC required to use actual sample month circumstances in determination).

### **TYPES OF AGENCY ERRORS (no penalty) (1 total):**

**1- CS income budgeting:** agency average include a check that was lost and voided as well as the re-issued check for same amount. Obscure enough and difficult enough to determine in KIDS that QC chose to not assess a penalty.

### **TYPES OF CLIENT ERRORS (2 total):**

**2- Shelter:** In the first, the client failed to report reduction in rent at review. Agency only required to verify if client moves or reports a change. Client received housing assistance and did not report that. In the second case the client provided a fraudulent mortgage document; in reality the mortgage had been satisfied eight years previous.

### **WHEN WERE THE APES MADE?**

Of the 10 APES, 8 were made at re-certifications, and 1 was at application, and one was at a reported change.

### **TRENDS OR RECOMMENDATIONS?**

- **Location:** The preponderance of APE errors were made in Milwaukee (10% compared to 2% in rest of the state), so initiatives toward Milwaukee payment accuracy continue to be advisable.
- **Failure to Act:** A couple cases show that frequent transfers of cases within Milwaukee County or multiple workers covering each case could be contributing to the error rate; the ES worker may have no awareness of case management in the sense of what the FS group is about. Rather than any relatively long-term management, they are acting on episodes, and occurrences. One case, where client reported pregnancy on January 2002, has had eight workers make case comments and actions up through March 2004. The fifth worker since the pregnancy report ended the pregnancy segment because they got an alert that the pregnancy was overdue. No action to add the baby or father of the child to the FS group in 3 subsequent reviews was taken. In another case, five workers were involved between the time the verification needed to add a child was submitted, and the time the person-add auxiliary FS was made.

### **“BIGGEST CONTRIBUTORS”: The cases that caused the largest dollar errors for January 2004 (including client errors):**

- **Milwaukee County, \$259 Agency Preventable Error:** The customer reported a pregnancy in January 2002. The prospective father was in the home, but not the FS group. An ES worker end-dated the pregnancy screen upon receiving an alert that the due date had passed. There is no indication the client was asked if the child was born, at that point or at the three

subsequent reviews. State QC discovered the child had been born, and never added, nor was the employed father added, which would have put the group over the FS gross income limit. While there may have been intentional failure by the client to report the child's birth because the father would be added, there is nothing to indicate the ES workers involved ever asked the obvious question.

- **Milwaukee County, \$101 Agency Preventable Error:** Verification that had been requested at a review was received late, and the FS were re-opened. There was a break in FS eligibility so the FS should have not re-opened without a new signed request.
- **Milwaukee County, \$100 Agency Preventable Error:** Verification needed to add a baby was provided 12/24/03, but an auxiliary not completed in time to be included in the amount reviewed for the January sample. The auxiliary was actually requested on 12/24, but for some reason not approved, and sat pending. On Jan 19<sup>th</sup> the worker canceled the pending auxiliary and reissued a slightly smaller one. If they had issued even the incorrect first one on time they wouldn't have had an error for January. The ESS had a "25 clearance" so apparently needed approval for the issuance; despite staff shortages over the winter holidays the agency should have had some arrangements for these regularly occurring events. (There may have been another reason for the delay but this is what we could conclude. )

mbw 05/26/04